

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER

Vol. 38.—No. 5.] LONDON, SATURDAY, FEB. 3, 1821. [Price 6d

TO THE PUBLIC.

—o—

COBBETT'S REGISTER is now published by JOHN M. COBBETT, at No. 1, Clement's Inn, London, where it will continue to be published, till a place more convenient for the Public can be provided. Should any person, in town or country, find a difficulty in obtaining this work, such person will please to make the difficulty known at the above office, by letter, postage paid, or verbally. At the same place are sold, *Peep at Pears, Links of Lower House*, (next Saturday), *Cobbett's Year's Residence in America*, a *New Year's Gift to the Farmers*, and a *Sermon to the Good Methodists*, and the "*Queen's Answer to the King's Letter to his People*."—Book-sellers and others, who reside in the country, and who may, of late, have been disappointed in their regular supply, will have the goodness to apply to the office, as above pointed out. COBBETT'S REGISTER will be published on *Royal Paper*, and with a STAMP, on Saturday, the 31st of March, in just the same manner that it formerly was. The unstamped publication will be continued; but, the stamp is become necessary, in order to make the work reach persons in country places, and in Ireland and Scotland, whence there are such numerous applications for it, and whither it is impossible to convey it with regularity and speed without the assistance of the *Post Office*. In most cases, out of London, it will, in the end, reach the reader with less cost with a stamp than

without it; and, in almost every case, it will reach him *two days earlier* than it can now. In order to prevent inconvenience in binding the volumes, the present volume will be closed with the Number of 24th March; so that the stamp will begin with a new volume. The stamped Register will be to be obtained from *Newsmen*, in the same manner that newspapers are; but, should any Gentleman be at a loss as to the channel of making the application, he may apply through the Office, as above, with the certainty of his application being carefully attended to. A new Edition of *Paper against Gold* is now ready, on fine paper and good print, price 5s. bound in boards.

A LETTER

TO

MR. BROUGHAM.

On the Debate respecting the Omission of the Queen's name in the Liturgy.

London, 1. February, 1821.

SIR,

To all the long list of inconsistencies I am now, sinner that I am, about to add another: for, in my last Register I proposed

M

to write, ~~this~~ work, about the *reduction of salaries* and the talk-
ed-of alteration in the *gold-stand-*
ard; and, I am going to write,
not about them; but about the
Debate on the Liturgy! This is
being as *inconsistent* as a girl
whose taste changes from black
eyes to blue eyes; or, as a beagle,
which, having started a rabbit,
comes athwart the scent of, and
pursues, a hare. The truth is,
however, that I had not *read* the
Debate on the Liturgy question,
when the last Register went to
the press. Having read it, I
found it to involve matter of
great importance. That being
the case, I thought it right to
offer to the public my thoughts
on it; and, for reasons which
may, probably, appear by-and-by,
I have upon this occasion, cho-
sen to address my observations
to you.

As it is possible, that this Let-
ter may be read by some, who will
not have strictly attended to the
motion out of which the Debate
arose, it may not be unnecessary
to state, that that *motion* (made
by LORD ARCHIBALD HAMIL-
TON) was in these words:
"That the Order in Council of
the 12th of February, 1820,
which *excluded* the name of her
Majesty, Caroline Amelia Eli-

zabeth, from the Prayers of
the Church, appears to this
House to be a measure ill-ad-
vised and inexpedient."

To talk on an occasion like
this, about the *times of verbs* may,
to some, appear pedantic; but
you, who are preparing a "*di-*
gest" for *educating* us, will allow,
that a sentence so short, and em-
ployed on such an occasion, and
in the "Great Council" too,
ought to have been correct; and
I am sure you will not say that
"*excluded*," in one part of this
sentence ought to have been
followed by "*to be*," in another
part. Of the two words, which
characterise the measure, one
seems to have been wholly *unne-*
cessary. Surely we might, in
cases like this, look for correct-
ness of language without being
deemed very unreasonable, or
foolishly nice!

This *motion* was opposed by
an *amendment* in these words:
"That this House do now
"*adjourn*," which was carried
by 310 votes against 208; the
majority in favour of the Minis-
ters being 101. From this it has
been concluded, by some persons,
that the same majority would
vote against putting the Queen's
name in the Liturgy; but, though
this *may* be the fact, this deci-

sion is no proof of it, as we shall by-and-by see.

I impute no *bad* motives to the mover, nor, indeed, to his party; but, I am very sure, that this motion was "*ill-advised*;" and that, without intending it, the mover and all those who had any thing to do in bringing forward such a motion, did injury, rather than benefit, to the cause of the Queen.

The motion was *feeble*; it was *puerile*; it had no openly avowed *practical purpose* in view. A motion to *insert the name* would have been *something*. It would have had reason in it. It would have stood on clear and solid ground, which was not the case with the present motion. A thing that is merely *inexpedient* may imply no blame, or very little blame in the actor. A thing may be *just*, though *inexpedient*. A thing may be *lawful*, though unjust and *inexpedient*. The first thing to be considered in an act of a penal kind is the *legality*; and, if by taking advantage of the letter, or of some omission, in the law, you really do that which is not right and equitable, there is *injustice*; and it is by no means

unfrequent to hear Judges expressing their *sorrow*, that the law obliges them to do this or that. But, an act may be both *legal* and *just*, and yet *inexpedient*. According to the rules of Public Law, a *war* may be *lawful* and *just*; and yet, to enter upon such war may be *inexpedient*. If I am stricken by a man of ten times my strength, it is *legal* and *just* for me to return the blow; but, it is by no means *expedient*, seeing the certainty of greater evil arising from my act.

Now, in the first place, by declaring the omission of the Queen's name to have been *inexpedient*, and nothing more, is it not *admitted* by the movers, that the omission was neither *illegal* nor *unjust*? Think of this, Sir; and say, whether you, as her Majesty's *law-adviser*, ought not to have *opposed* the motion. Here is an act, which I contend was *illegal* and *unjust*; and, if I drop these charges against it, and content myself with the charge of *inexpediency*, do I not *abandon* the other two charges? Do I not confess, that those charges were *unfounded*? Do I not, in *effect*, declare, that the act was *legal* and *just*? And, in a case like

the present, do I not do monstrous injury to the cause of the person against whom the act has been committed?

The charge of doing what is *inexpedient* is never a very heavy charge, under any circumstances. It amounts to an imputation of *oversight*; *error of judgment*; or, at most, to a want of sufficient wisdom; and these do not imply crime. Besides, if we abandon our charges of *illegality* and *injustice*; if we, by implication, allow the act to have been *legal* and *just*, our hearers will not be inclined to censure very severely an act which is merely *inexpedient*.

Therefore, if any motion had been to be made on the subject of the *Omission*, it ought to have contained the charges of *illegality* and *injustice*, or, of the latter at least. And, why did this motion not contain those charges? Mr. WETHERELL proved the *illegality* as clearly as the daylight is seen; and the speech of the ATTORNEY GENERAL, though very ingenious and able, did not shake the arguments of Mr. WETHERELL. And, as to the *injustice*, that was upon the lips of every one, except those of the Ministers and their friends. All the *Addresses* to the Queen; all the *sets* of

Resolutions; all the *Speeches* at meetings for *Addresses*; all the *Petitions on the subject*; all these had spoken either of the *injustice* of the *Omission*, or of the *necessity of the insertion*. But, out comes the *motion*, at last, and talks only of the *inexpediency* of the omission. Really, such a motion merited no better answer than a motion for *adjournment*; which is the same as saying: "*Let us go home: let us go home: let us not waste our lungs in talking about this thing.*"

The truth is, that, though a thing may be both *legal* and *just*, and yet not *expedient*, this *Omission* was not a thing of this sort; for, if it were *legal* to leave out the Queen's name, and if it were *just* to do it, what could possibly render it *inexpedient*? The only thing that could make it *just* was the knowledge of something in the conduct of the Queen that would cause the insertion of her name to appear to be a *mockery* of religion. And, surely, this would have made the *Omission expedient*; or, else, no measure in the world ever deserved to be called expedient. And yet this motion called the measure *inexpedient*, while it appeared to acknowledge, that it might be *legal* and *just*!

Besides, if *inexpediency* was all that you had to alledge against the measure, why did the allegation *sleep so long*? and this question, Sir, I put directly *to you*. It was put by Lord CASTLEREAGH, and with perfect fairness and consistency, and also with great effect. The omission took place and was proclaimed on the 12th of February, 1820. The Parliament was sitting at the time. You had many opportunities of moving on the question. You were her Majesty's *Law adviser* then, and you had, I dare say, not lost any time in reminding her of her power to place you *before the bar*, by making you her Attorney General. Why were you silent, then, upon that occasion? Had you any *doubts* in your mind? Did you *suspect* that there was something in her Majesty's conduct, that would make the omission *just*? If you did, how shall I describe your meanness in condescending to accept (not to say *solicit*) the office of her *Attorney General*? and, if you had no such suspicion; if you regarded her Majesty as the victim of calumny and of a foul conspiracy, how shall I describe your I do not know what to call it, in not protesting, in your place in Parliament, against the omission

of her name? and with what grace, with what *consistency*, do you now come forward to complain of the omission, and that, too, solely on the ground of its *inexpediency*.

Her Majesty, amidst all those scenes of libertinism, which her evil enemies have described as being her delight, could see at once, *as soon as an English newspaper met her eye*, all the importance belonging to this question of the Liturgy. *She* instantly wrote to the Prime Minister to lay her remonstrance before the Archbishop. What, was her *Law-adviser* so blind, that he could discover no part of this importance? *That* was the time to complain of the *Omission*. *Now* is the time to demand the *insertion*. But, not a word did you then say about the omission, though duty, gratitude, every thing demanded a strenuous remonstrance at your hands.

The injury done to the Queen by your neglect in this respect was very great. If the remonstrance had *then* been made; if it had been dwelt on in a suitable manner; if the injustice of an *unheard* person being thus punished had been well pointed out; if the nature and character and proceedings of the Milan Com-

mission (with all which you were so well acquainted) had been *then* described to the country, and that, too, *just before the elections*; if all this had been done, do you think, and can any man think, that we should have seen the things, which have since taken place?

Aye! but you were otherwise engaged at the time at the Omission took place; for, we now find, that, *in April*, you were receiving *from the Ministers* a set of propositions, the *basis* of which was, *the Queen's keeping out of the Country!* We find, that you undertook to *communicate these to the Queen*. And so far from your complaining about the Omission of her name, the Ministers have declared to your face, that they received from you, no remonstrance at all; but, that they thought, that their measures, relative to her Majesty had *your hearty concurrence!* And, while you have never attempted to deny these statements of the Ministers, you have promised an "*explanation*" of your conduct relative to your transactions with them, and which explanation you have *never yet given*. You promised this explanation on the 7th of June last; and we have never

heard a word about it since that memorable day.

Indeed, it is to *you* that the Queen owes the best description of argument that has been used against the Ministers on this subject. In the first place you *said nothing* about the Liturgy; and, what did you do in the *Protocol Negotiation?* Why, you made the Liturgy the subject of *barter*. You proposed *equivalents* for it; and equivalents too, of so contemptible a nature as to render the whole thing *ridiculous*. It was to be bartered for a *reception at foreign courts*; and *now* the mere *inexpediency* of it is to be a subject whereon to divide the House of Commons!

However, *your view* of the matter never was the Queen's view; and, it is perfectly proper, that her Majesty should persist and that the people should persist in demanding this part of *her rights*. But, the mode of doing this, is to apply for the *insertion*. This would bring out the whole matter, if the insertion were resisted. The Ministers must defend the legality and the justice of their measure. And they must produce the *grounds*, upon which they proceeded; grounds a little better

than "*rumours*," and those rumours only *alleged* to have existed. They must tell, flatly and plainly, from *whom* they got their information. They must account for their *not having previously questioned* Dr. Holland, Mr. Craven, the English Ladies in the suite of the Queen, and, above all, Sicard; and for their *preferring* the evidence, collected at Milan, from such people as Majocchi, Damont, and Rastelli. A motion of this sort would bring the whole matter out. But, to build an attack upon them on the *inexpediency* of the Omission, really seems to have been an abandonment of the Queen, while it could answer no purpose other than that of giving a proof of which was known before; namely, that her Majesty was very wise in never having *submitted herself to the guidance of the will of the House of Commons*.

There were two contingent points in the Debate, which are worthy of particular notice; namely, the *recrimination* of the Ministers, by the mouth of LORD CASTLEREAGH; and the *Political Sins* of the Queen, as stated by that brilliant gentleman, ALDERMAN HEYGATE

As to the former, Lord Castlereagh did certainly lay well on upon the Whigs of 1806. I was delighted with his exclamation: "it is for *them*, indeed, to talk of *prejudging* her Majesty!" His Lordship is accused by you of the happy talent of *piling up adjectives and adverbs*; but, Sir, there was something more than a piling up of adjectives on this occasion, as we shall see. "What," said he, "was their conduct towards the Queen herself? Did they, on a former occasion, when her honour and character were affected by *secret charges*, give her the benefit of a *public trial*? Did they proceed according to any of the *known and received forms of justice*, or the *established laws of evidence*? Or did they not place her whole life and character under the investigation of four Commissioners, having at their head Lord Erskine himself; who was in the habit of talking so much about the inestimable *privileges of trial by Jury*, and who lately boasted that he had spent his whole life in the defence of the laws of his country and the maintenance of the *pure principles of British justice*? Was it for the party

" who sanctioned such an *inqui-*
 " *sitorial* mode of proceeding to
 " talk now of delicacy and *im-*
 " *partial justice*? Their pro-
 " fessions would be rightly esti-
 " mated by their practice, when
 " it was recollected that they had
 " instituted a *secret tribunal* to
 " try the Queen herself, of which
 " the Illustrious Person accused
 " knew nothing, did not know
 " that it was even in existence,
 " unless as far as she was made
 " acquainted with it by rumour,
 " and which *secret tribunal* closed
 " *its sittings* without giving her
 " an opportunity of offering a *sin-*
 " *gle word* in her defence, until
 " she was brought up to receive
 " judgment from the late King;
 " and a *heavy judgment* it was,
 " and must be considered as
 " long as there was any thing
 " like female delicacy in the na-
 " tion. Never had the Queen
 " cause to complain of any body
 " of public men so much as of
 " those who had lately become
 " her zealous and ardent pari-
 " zans, but who had *sacrificed*
 " *her before for their purposes,*
 " and were *doing the same now*
 " under the specious pretext of
 " a love of justice and a re-
 " gard for the injured reputation
 " of a woman, whose character
 " they had before held up to pub-

" *lic and private animadversion*
 " [hear!]. That she should be
 " politically connected with this
 " party was the greatest of all
 " her misfortunes, and from his
 " soul he felt *compassion for her*
 " *situation.*"

Were we not referring to the
 words of so immaculate a person,
 we might make use of the old
 similitude about "the Devil's re-
 buking sin;" but, at any rate,
 this was not "*piling up* ad-
 jectives and adverbs;" here was
substance; and nothing in this
 world was ever more home to the
 point. And, Sir, I looked in
 vain, to you, for something to
 parry this deadly thrust. The
 proceedings of 1806 were all that
 Lord Castlereagh has here describ-
 ed them; and, the conclusion in
 the mind of every man is, and
 must be, that the Queen *never*
found a friend, till the People
 took her cause in hand. The
 Noble piler of adjectives is, how-
 ever, deceived in one respect:
 the Queen will never *again* be
sacrificed by a party. She now
 knows, that the People are her
 strong hold; her only safe reli-
 ance; and, while she continues
 to demand *all her rights*, she will
 of course wish success to every
 one who is sincerely disposed to
 give them, and honestly op-

posed to those who withhold them.

There was another part of Lord Castlereagh's Speech, that had something more than *Adjectives* in it. It quoted the words of Mr. TIERNEY, when the charges against the Queen were first talked of, and where that gentleman had said, that "he would not vote one shilling towards a provision for the Queen, until the result of those charges was properly ascertained; for it was evident that either the Queen was insulted, or the King was betrayed [hear, hear!]" This shewed how serious that Right Honourable Gentleman took those charges to be at the time, and how necessary it was to institute proceedings upon them."

This is very true; and, I remember also, that this same gentleman has, on a subsequent occasion, gone out of his way to observe, that it was *he*, and not the Queen's moderation, which made her allowance *thirty five* instead of *fifty* thousand a year. This gentleman is looked upon as the leader of the Opposition; and he has never yet made a speech for the Queen! He is always on the reserve. These things are quite enough to make

the Queen cautious: or, indeed, to make her trust to no party; but place her reliance on the People, who have saved her from degradation in spite of direct power and of treachery, more dangerous than openly employed power. I said at the time, that Mr. TIERNEY appeared to be in great haste to refuse the Queen money. He appeared to me to seem to say, that there was something in the charges. His words did in some degree, certainly give countenance to her answers. It was curious to hear him say, that the Queen had been insulted, or, the king betrayed. The insult to the Queen was evident enough; but, it was hard to see the treachery towards the king, in leaving the Queen's name out of the Liturgy! This Right Honourable Person has, all along, taken good care not to say any thing that shall commit him on the side of the Queen; and, indeed, in the present motion we discover nothing, that can lead us to suppose, that the innocence of the Queen is intended to be the ground of any of this gentleman's exertions against the Ministers; while every one must see, that any thing short of that is not a taking part with her. All these things her Majesty will

do well to *keep in mind*; and to regulate herself accordingly.

The Ministers dealt, in this debate, pretty fairly by the Queen. They followed the example of the Speech from the Throne, which breathed a conciliating spirit, and which was peculiarly decent with regard to her Majesty. They did not attempt to *criminate*. They said nothing to insult or provoke her. They very wisely kept silence as to what has been called her "*radical doctrines*;" and, for the best of reasons, let us hope: that is, that they well know, those doctrines to be *sound and true*. It was for *Alderman Heygate* to rip open this sore, and to discover, that the Queen's politics of the *Summer and Autumn* rendered an exclusion of her name from the *Liturgy expedient in the foregoing winter*! Or, at least, forbade him to say it was *inexpedient*, though he confessed that he *disapproved of the omission*.

MR. HEYGATE is not a person with the report of whose speeches I delight to fill up any part of my limited pages, but his speech of the 24th of January contains matter that I cannot wholly omit. It is important on account of several assertions

made by this man, and particularly the assertions relating to the *advice* which the Queen has followed in *preference* to *yours* and Mr. Denman's, with whose sentiments and whose *endeavours* MR. HEYGATE seems to have become, *somehow or other*, pretty well acquainted. I shall, therefore, insert the part of the alderman's speech that relates to this matter, which is a matter of great importance, because it involves the question: has the Queen been *well-advised* by her *unofficial*, or by her *official* advisers? It is, the alderman asserts, the unofficial advisers, whose advice has been adopted; and, it is of consequence to ascertain, whether the advice of the others would have saved her Majesty. But, first, let us hear MR. HEYGATE as to the fact. "This subject was not to be decided by the Queen's guilt or innocence alone as to the charges preferred against her. There was another very important consideration; the line of political conduct which her Majesty had chosen to pursue since her return to this country and which was not more unbecoming her dignity, than at variance with the counsels of her sound and legitimate advisers. This line of conduct she had per-

“severed in during the last four
 “months; yet, on her first coming
 “to this country, and when the
 “proceedings against her had just
 “commenced, *she declared that she*
 “*would not mix her cause*; the
 “vindication of her character and
 “honour; yes, she said *she would*
 “*not mix up that cause with the*
 “*views of any political party*
 “*whatever*. Unfortunately, her
 “Majesty did not persist in that
 “determination many days; she
 “soon put her name to a letter
 “addressed to her Sovereign and
 “husband; yes, to her husband,
 “and he spoke as he was sure
 “every man would speak, who
 “felt for the character of his
 “country; this letter contained
 “sentiments, which, addressed to
 “a private Gentleman, would
 “have been considered disre-
 “spectful in the extreme, but,
 “when applied to the Sovereign,
 “became little less than what,
 “in any other person, must
 “have been visited with the
 “punishment of the law. This
 “letter was followed by a
 “long series of attacks on both
 “Houses, in which she did not
 “hesitate to say that if the Bill
 “were to pass, it must be grave-
 “ly proposed to the people
 “whether it ought to be obeyed.
 “Direct encouragement was also

“held out to the Military, who
 “were paid by that House and
 “the Crown, to try how far they
 “ought to disobey both. If
 “others were now prepared to
 “forget those things, he was not
 “prepared to do so.—All ques-
 “tions became insignificant, com-
 “pared with the existence of
 “that Constitution by which the
 “nation prospered, and such
 “conduct tended to endanger that
 “Constitution. It therefore be-
 “came the House of Commons
 “to reflect, before it took any
 “steps which might be construed
 “into an approbation of such
 “proceedings. He did not wish
 “to make any unpleasant allu-
 “sions. It might have been
 “supposed that the foreign edu-
 “cation of the Queen, and her
 “imperfect knowledge of the
 “language might have led her
 “to have allowed sentiments to
 “go abroad of a dangerous na-
 “ture, without knowing the full
 “extent of them, or her feelings
 “might on some occasions have
 “made her intention appear
 “worse than it really was. For
 “those things he would be willing
 “to make all due allowance, and
 “if the mischief of which he
 “complained had happened only
 “once or twice, he should not
 “then have taken notice of it.

" But when it was not once or
 " twice, but repeatedly, that
 " those insults were offered to the
 " State and the Sovereign, when
 " they were renewed at every
 " opportunity, and were to be
 " met perpetually in every news-
 " paper which contained her an-
 " swers to addresses, and that after
 " repeated remonstrances from
 " her best advisers, he could not
 " think but something serious
 " was intended by the persons
 " by whom she was surrounded.
 " But if nothing further was in-
 " tended, and nothing, he knew,
 " was more contrary to the ad-
 " vice which she received from her
 " legal advisers, whose good
 " sense, judgment, and real pa-
 " triotism, made them aware of
 " the evil that her cause must sus-
 " tain from such proceedings,
 " while the triumphant exertions
 " of their talent bore it up even
 " against those disadvantages;
 " yet he must repeat, if nothing
 " further was intended, Parlia-
 " ment ought still to consider,
 " that should they carry up an
 " Address to the Throne in favour
 " of a person who had so con-
 " ducted herself, it would appear
 " as if they acted upon a recog-
 " nition of the propriety of such
 " conduct."

I will not attempt to meddle

with the *logic* of the Alderman,
 as that might seem *unmanly*; but
 confine myself to his assertions
 relative to the *Queen's Advisers*.
 He says, then, that *her Majesty's*
Letter to the King, and almost the
 whole of her *answer to the Ad-*
dress, were at *variance with the*
counsels of her legitimate advi-
sers; that, at first, she *declared*
that she would not mix her cause
up with political parties, and
 that she soon abandoned this line
 of conduct; that *her legal advi-*
sers repeatedly remonstrated with
her; that **HE KNOWS** that *her*
Letter and Answers were con-
trary to the advice of her legal
advisers. And he throws all the
 blame upon persons by whom she
 has been surrounded.

Now, Sir, in the first place,
 Mr. ALDERMAN HEYGATE, Mem-
 ber for Sudbury, must KNOW,
 that you and Mr. Denman did ad-
 vise against the Letter and
 Answers; or, Mr. Alderman
 Heygate must be a LIAR! I
 put this alternative only to shew
 the fact the more strongly; be-
 cause every one who knows the
 gentleman knows him to be inca-
 pable of telling a lie. Besides,
 you and Mr. Denman heard him
 make the assertion, and did not
 contradict him. So that it is *true*
 that you and your colleague did

disapprove of the Letter and the Answers; that you did *remonstrate* against them; and that you did all in your power to endeavour to prevent them. It is true also, that her Majesty acted by *your* and your colleague's advice, when the Queen declared, that she would not mix up her *cause* with that of *political complainants*.

Very well, then, your advice has *not been followed* by the Queen, and, now, let us see.—The Queen, it is well known, and I take the liberty to *assert it*, came to *England against your advice*. I assert, that I have heard from good authority, that you pressed Count Vassali and Baron Bergami to go after her from St. Omers, and to get her back. I have also heard from good authority, that you sent a letter to the Queen on board the Packet, advising her not to cross the Channel. What passed in the Protocol negociation all the world knows. I assert it to be my firm belief, that you and your colleague advised her Majesty to follow the advice, tendered to her by the House of Commons through those luckless Deputies, Messrs. Wilberforce, Bankes, Wortley, and Ackland. The Letter and the Answers Mr. Heygate KNOWS

that you disapproved of and remonstrated against.

Well, then, how stands the matter? The Queen has *defeated and humbled all her enemies*. Her Majesty is declared by the Ministers themselves to have been *acquitted*; they declare her to be *entitled to all her rights as Queen Consort*; and the king, in his Speech, recommends to the Parliament *the making of a provision for her*. You yourself boast, that she has triumphed; but, Alderman Heygate KNOWS, and he tells you so to your face, that she has triumphed by following advice that you disapproved of and remonstrated against! What could he have said more cutting to you? His long appears to have been intended for *another*, and even for a *brother Alderman*; but, it has run you and your colleague through; and there it leaves you spitted like a couple of larks, instead of your being like a file of knights, "*keeping together in your chivalry in a well-foughten field*."

The Queen has triumphed. And from what *cause*? Not from the skill, zeal and ability of her *lawyers*, as is proved by the *votes* of the *Tribunal*. Let

us trace her triumph backwards. The Bill, though *carried*, was abandoned; and, *why*? Because the *nation* said *nay*. What was the cause of this *nay*? The *press*, and especially the *Letter of the Queen* and her *Answers to Addresses*. What set the press in motion? Her coming to England. And what brought her to England? Her *own heroic mind*. To her Majesty herself belongs the greatest share of the merit. To her own mind it belongs; and, when we are brought to contemplate the circumstances evincing the strength of that mind, we always conclude the long catalogue with that of her having *disdained to follow your advice*!

This conclusion is inevitable. It is so clear a matter, that it admits of neither dispute nor doubt. The Queen and the nation clearly understand it; and it is no wonder that the House of Commons should burst out into a *roar of laughter*, when, on the 25th, in answer to your sarcasms on the *difficulty of catching and keeping Heygate*, he replied, that, in your complaints against him, he saw plainly the recollection of your failure in endeavouring to catch *another alderman*! A good hit at *you*; but, the stroke

must, upon cool reflection, have given Heygate nearly as much pain as it gave you. It was curious enough to hear him praising you at Mr. Alderman Wood's expense on the 24th, and to hear him praising Mr. Wood at your expense on the 25th! The truth is, you had bit him so sharply, on the 25th, that he was induced to suspend, for a moment, his less acute, though more inveterate, feelings towards his brother Alderman.

In the course of the Debate of the 25th Mr. LOCKART observed, that he was a friend of the Ministers, and, that, for *their sakes*, he wished the name of her Majesty to be placed in the *Liturgy*. His argument was this: that, as long as the Queen was harshly treated by the Ministers; and, especially, as long as her name was excluded from the Liturgy, she would not be visited by the *Good and Able*; and, of course, she would remain in the hands of such as those, who had advised the *Letter to the King* and the *Answers to addresses*. Very good; only a little mistake as to the *Good and Able*. Certain it is, that, if the Ministers wish to take from the Queen's *Friends and Advisers* one great means of giv-

ing annoyance to them, they ought to put her Majesty's name in the Liturgy, without loss of time. But, I can go no further with Mr. Lockart. I cannot allow, that her Majesty has acted upon *bad advice*. I cannot compare her famous *Answers* to the "revolutionary nonsense of the French." And I do verily believe, that, if Mr. Lockart had been of the "Queen's Cabinet," the Queen herself would, at this moment have been a *Wanderer*!

LORD NUGENT, in this same debate, spoke in the same way respecting the *Answers* to Addresses. He said, that "he would be the last man to say, many of those answers were not highly improper, or that they did not reflect great disgrace, not on her Majesty, but on those by whom her Majesty had been advised to present them. At the same time, the unfortunate and anomalous situation of her Majesty, the persecution she had suffered, the obloquy that had been heaped upon her by a venal press; all these were circumstances which ought to be taken into account, in estimating the course which she had pursued. It was, in his opinion, not very manly, harshly to condemn

"her Majesty under such circumstances. It was too much like the conduct of Spanish Inquisitors, who, having stretched their victim on the rack, converted the ravings of pain into additional matter of accusation. This he could not think manly or English Conduct. Undoubtedly, he confessed, that he thought with the Honourable Alderman, that many passages in the *Answers* of her Majesty to the Addresses that had been presented to her were extremely reprehensible, and that they reflected great disgrace on the good sense and education of those who had advised her Majesty to make them. But this he would say, that ill as he thought of those who had advised her Majesty to make those answers, he thought, the blame which those persons had justly incurred, vanished into air, compared with the blame to which those persons were liable who had advised his Majesty to give the answers which he had given to Addresses from certain bodies of the people."

Now, though I dare say, that the Queen is very much obliged to this Lord for the advice that

he would have given her; yet, having been saved; having triumphed; having obtained a complete victory over power so terrible; having laid all her foes prostrate at her feet: the Queen, though very much obliged to Lord Nugent for the advice that he would have given, can, I should suppose, scarcely regret that she did not follow advice different from that which she has followed. Besides, it may, I think, reasonably be asked, why this gallant young Grenville did not go to her Majesty, and offer her his services, upon her arrival! The noble Lord may recollect, that her Majesty was here a long while before she was visited by any person of high rank. And, it is well known, that her legal advisers, as they are ridiculously called, and all the other persons pretending to any degree of public importance, advised her to adopt a line of conduct, that would, to a certainty, have sent her out of the country, a despised, or, at best, a pitied wanderer. Lord Nugent may say what he pleases about the disgrace attached to those who advised the answers; but if the advice of the "constitutional advisers" had been followed, in this respect, does his lordship believe, that the Queen would ever have gone to

Saint Pauls! Oh, no! what Heygate says is very true; that her Majesty was advised, at first, to reject all idea of common cause with the people. It is very true that this was the language of the answers to Nottingham and to Preston; and that it was, by the advisers of those two answers, intended to pursue this line of conduct. But, it became the duty of the real friends of her Majesty to warn her of her danger; to lay before her a true picture of the state of the country: to explain clearly to her the causes of public discontent; to inform her faithfully as to the effects produced on the public mind by different parts of her conduct; to tell her, in short, every thing, which it was necessary for her to know; to do all this with as much brevity as clearness would permit; and, to do it, besides, in language, in a tone and manner, and with an unobtrusiveness, which were calculated to awaken her attention and to gain her confidence. This is what it became the duty of her Majesty's real friends to do; and, they appear to have done it. It was their first duty to convince her, that there was volunteer talent at her service: then to point out what steps ought to be taken: and then enable her to

take them, and take them with effect too. The public has seen clearly enough, that the "constitutional advisers" were supplanted in the Council of her Majesty. We have also seen what degree of mortification this has given them; but, it is impossible for those who *wished well* to the Queen not to congratulate her Majesty upon her conduct in having turned her back upon their advice.

Through the whole of this trying scene her Majesty has shown great wisdom as well as fortitude and courage; but in nothing has she discovered more wisdom than in her *choice of advisers*. Her Majesty had a very difficult part to act. If she followed the advice of her "constitutional advisers," she *lost the people*. If she rejected that advice, she made almost enemies, or, at least, she *deeply offended*, the men who had *her case* in their hands. Now, I really do not believe, that this rejection had any effect upon your conduct as *lawyers*. I do not impute to you any thing so wicked as this. But, her Majesty *must* have perceived great danger from this cause and yet, she did reject your

advice; and, in so doing, she saved herself. Never was there a situation of greater difficulty than that of her Majesty; and never did human being act with more wisdom than her Majesty did upon this occasion.

As to her *Majesty's Letter to the King*, let those who censure it, recollect, that it was written at a time, when public prints, almost calling themselves official, were loading her with the most infamous charges; when a *bill*, describing her as an *adulteress*, and even *worse*, had been *printed*, and circulated all over the world; and when it had, in the unprosecuted part of the public press, been openly avowed, that she ought to be *sacrificed as a martyr*, if she *could not* be punished as a *criminal*. All these things had grown out of a Message and Green Baga, laid before Parliament in *the King's name*! And, was the Queen to remain *silent*? If she answered, was she to answer in a way that would not have bespoken *deep resentment*, and that would have argued a lurking consciousness of guilt? Or, did it become her to remonstrate in the tone of an injured Queen, a slandered woman, and a *mother* whose heart-strings had been tugged at without mercy? She wrote as it

became her to write : she communicated her own feelings to the heart of every faithful wife, every tender mother, every kind husband, and every affectionate child. Her Letter awakened sympathy in every humane breast : it roused resentment against her cruel persecutors and slanderers : while, at the same time, it inspired universal *confidence* in her courage as well as her innocence.

Is not this a true description of the origin and nature of this so-much-censured Letter ? Let the Letter be *forgotten* : but, let also the odious *Bill* be forgotten. History will, however, speak of the *latter* ; and ought it not also to speak of the *former* ? Let, with all my heart, *all* be buried in *oblivion* : but, let it be *all*, or *none*.

It is natural enough for the *enemies* of the Queen to censure her *Letter to the king* ; to call it *ill-advised* and the like ; but, it seems very strange to hear such censure from those who call themselves her *friends*. Do those friends happen to know, that this Letter was translated and published all over the Continent of Europe ? Do they know, that about half a million of copies were printed in America ? I have reason to be well convinced, that it *decided* the question in the

latter country. Is it nothing to have awakened sympathy and admiration in the breasts of *such a People* ? And, was such measure a thing to censure by her Majesty's *friends* ? Does this measure deserve to be looked upon as reprehensible and as reflecting *disgrace* by those who advised it ? However, let others think what they will of it, her Majesty seems to have had the wisdom of the measure confirmed in her mind by time and reflection ; for, in that portrait, which she has done the City of London the very great honour of presenting to it, she is represented (if I am rightly informed, for I have never seen the picture) as holding in her hand a letter "*to the King*."

There is another circumstance, relating to this letter, which appears to have been wholly overlooked ; namely, that the *publication* of it was not her Majesty's act, so much as it was the act of the King's advisers. The letter contains a solemn protest ; an earnest remonstrance. Did these receive any *answer* ? No : they were treated with silent disdain ; so that her Majesty was compelled to lay the letter before the world, or yield herself up as a martyr.

It is very curious, too, that,

amongst the infinite number of the revilers of her Majesty on account of this letter, no one has ever undertaken to *answer* it. Surely some one might have been found to give an answer, if an answer could have been given; but there was no answer ever given to this letter, though it has been the subject of so much censure from both sides of the houses of parliament.

Notwithstanding all that has been said about the Letter's being abusive of *the King*. It really does contain no such abuse. Every illegal act; every cruel measure; every thing, in short, of which her Majesty seriously complains, in that Letter; all these are ascribed, not to his Majesty but to his advisers; and yet there have been people so stupid or so malignant as to represent this Letter as containing matter amounting to *High Treason*! After all, however, we have only to listen a little while with attention to discover, that the great offence of this Letter is that it complained of the *Constitution of the tribunal*, on account of the *influence* which her Majesty supposed would be exercised by the Ministers against her Majesty upon her trial. This was the great sin of the Letter;

to which may be added that her Majesty declared, that her confidence in the House of Commons; that is to say, her expectation of fair play in that House was not greater than her expectation of fair play in the other House. These are the great and real sins of the Queen's Letter, in the eyes of those who assail it. This was striking *hard*, I allow. It was striking in a tender part, too; but, now let us see whether nothing can be found to give the appearance of justice and reasonableness to this part of her Majesty's memorable epistle.

You will hardly pretend, Sir, that her Majesty has not as good a right to speak freely upon such a subject as *you have*. You will hardly pretend this, and now then let us hear what you thought proper to say upon this subject during the debate of the 25th January. I shall take your words as printed in the Morning Chronicle of the 29th January which, you will observe, was four days after the debate had taken place; a space of time which had, of course, given the Reporter or yourself time for revision. Your attack upon the tribunal above referred to, was so bold; was so violent, that the Speaker thought himself called

upon to interrupt you. I shall therefore give the whole, the Speaker's interruption and all; and I beseech the revilers of her Majesty's Letter to the King to read it with attention.

"If at a time when not only justice, but all the forms which were the handmaids of justice, were violated for the one purpose of destroying the Queen (unless indeed, he should add that of distracting the country), he might be allowed to follow so vicious and unparliamentary a precedent he should be able to give a satisfactory answer to the noble Lord. He could shew, that of the illustrious individuals who composed the majorities and minorities; not one could possibly be influenced by the Royal Person who was the object of the prosecution; he could shew that the Royal Person who was the real prosecutor, was represented in that assembly which was to decide on his cause by his household, by his State Officers, by his Ministers themselves, and by all those who were open to influence, either from the highest rewards a Monarch could bestow, or from the lowest boons which a Peer could accept, to relieve a dependant or to conciliate an ad-

herent. Was this fact nothing in judging of the real value of a numerical majority? Was an array of influence great as this ever excited against individuals who presumed to call themselves judges [cheers]?

"The *Speaker* interposed, on the ground that it was irregular to remark on the motives which had influenced Members of the other house of parliament.

"Mr. *Brougham* remarked, that the Noble Lord (Lord Castlereagh) had himself wandered into discussion of the motives of the Peers, to which it was necessary that an answer should be given.

"After a few words from Lord Castlereagh.

"The *Speaker* said, that the distinction as to the remarks made upon the other House of Parliament was this:—At the end of every Session, the Journals of the House of Lords were communicated to the House of Commons, as the Votes of the Commons were regularly communicated to the Lords. As soon as the Journals of the Lords were so communicated, they became matters of historical record and whatever appeared on the face of them, could be remarked

" upon. The Noble Lord had re-
 " marked upon the reasons which
 " Noble Lords had given for their
 " votes, which, as he understood,
 " were professedly drawn from
 " the Protests which were of
 " course found on the Journals.
 " If the Noble Lord had gone
 " beyond this, as the Honourable
 " and Learned Gentleman seemed
 " to have understood him, he (the
 " Speaker) was remiss in not
 " having checked the Noble Lord
 " upon the same principle as he
 " had checked the Honourable
 " and Learned Gentleman.

" Lord Castlereagh observed,
 " he had argued that the Ministers
 " had not made the Bill a party
 " question in the other House.

" Mr. Brougham continued.—
 " If it was true that the Minister
 " had not made this a party ques-
 " tion, such a circumstance could
 " not by any possibility appear
 " on the face of the Journals, but
 " if such circumstances were so
 " recorded, it would not be found
 " on those Journals or any where
 " else, because it was notoriously
 " and directly contrary to the
 " fact (hear, hear!). Never,
 " not only in our own times, but
 " if they recurred to the history
 " of times beyond their own per-
 " sonal knowledge, they would
 " find that never, on any question,

" had a more violent spirit o
 " partiality been shown. His
 " Majesty's Ministers avowed
 " themselves the authors, the
 " patrons, and the managers of
 " the Bill, and had shown the
 " zeal and spirit of prosecuting
 " parties. If it so happened, in-
 " deed, that at last some (not of
 " the Ministers themselves be it
 " remembered, but of their ad-
 " herents) voted against the Bill,
 " would the Noble Lord contend,
 " that by the Ministerial side
 " alone were these symptoms of
 " impartiality shown? Was it
 " not notorious that there were
 " three or four of the Noble Lords
 " with whom it had been his habit
 " to act, with whose opinions he
 " had generally concurred, and
 " whose talents he had admired,
 " never more, indeed, than when
 " they had of late been so mis-
 " directed, who formed the most
 " active friends of the Bill, not in
 " voting, indeed, but in fair and
 " open debate? These Noble
 " Lords bore much of the brunt
 " and odium of the measure,
 " while the Ministers kept behind
 " at their safe and effectual labour
 " of entrapping and securing
 " votes."

Now, Sir, this is *history*:—the
 Queen's Letter, as to this matter,
 was *prophecy*. Her Majesty fore-

told what would naturally take place. You have stated what did take place: and, you are reduced to this dilemma: You have either given a false account, or her Majesty's anticipation was correct. You have spoken falsehood; or her Majesty's prophecy was true.

Then as to the *House of Commons*, what was said, only the other night, by Lord Folkestone? Did he not assert that the Minister was *sure of his Majority*, let the question be what it might. Since the division on the motion of Mr. Wetherell, have not several Members of that House declared the same thing, and in a great deal harsher language, that her Majesty declared in her Letter to the King relative to the House of Commons. What, then, was not the Queen to speak as freely as Members of the House of Commons speak! Is not her Majesty to believe that which the two parties say of each other? Or is she to regard them as man and wife; or, as the Law has it, *baron et femme*; and that, therefore, one cannot give evidence for or against the other? She is, I suppose, to regard the *in* party as the *baron*, and the *out* party as the *femme*; and

is to look upon their squabbles as unworthy of serious attention, as are those occasional interruptions of matrimonial bliss, which, in the opinion of some philosophers are necessary to the preservation of life to a lengthened period? Her Majesty, though a most admirable politician, can hardly be supposed to enter into these refinements. She, God bless her, has, I dare say, always looked upon the two parties as being in *earnest*. She has thought, doubtless, that they spoke *truth of each other*. And, of course, she, in her Letter to the King gave it as her opinion, that the Ministers, who were her prosecutors, would be as sure of a majority in the House of Commons, as they were of the same thing in the House of Lords. Her Majesty might, if she had chosen, have avoided all imputations of her own by merely stating what the two parties said of each other. She did not choose to pursue this course. She stated what she herself expected; and if you have truly stated the reality, her Majesty's statement appears to have been very far short of the length to which she might have gone.

Now, then, was it not wise,

also, to put forth this anticipation? If what you say with regard to the actual proceedings *be true*; if these things have taken place; did it not show great discernment in her Majesty to discover beforehand, that such things would take place? And did not the safety of her honour imperiously demand, that she should, *beforehand*, remonstrate upon the subject; put in her solemn protest against such things; and, that protest being treated with silent disdain, was it not *wisdom* in her Majesty, to lay it before the world throughout the whole of which the foul charges against her had been circulated?

Every man of sincerity and of common sense will say that this was a step, pointed out, not only by conscious innocence; not only by just resentment; not only by a love of honest fame; but by the *most perfect prudence*. And, say what they will about the "*Queen's Cabinet*;" let the individuals composing that Cabinet be who they may; let them be high, or let them be low; let them be loyal, or let them be radical; never, in the history of nations, was there a delicate and difficult matter, requiring, to a right understanding of all its

parts uncommon sagacity, great store of information, great knowledge of human nature, and, to judicious and efficient measures to be adopted, acquiring great coolness, perfect disinterestedness and powerful talent; never in the history of nations was there a matter like this conducted in a better manner, than this has been conducted, by those, be they who they may, who are called, in the way of sneer, the *Queen's Cabinet*." We have heard of none of the movements of this Cabinet. None of their intentions have ever leaked out. There have been no bickerings and squabbings and babblings amongst its Members. No nasty, dirty rivalships and jealousies and envies in *this* Cabinet. Nothing done to throw ridicule on any thing coming forth under the sanction of her Majesty. The Members of the Cabinet as much unknown to the world as are the angels that watch over and protect human innocence. And to crown the whole, this "*Cabinet*," if Cabinet you will have it, has had to counteract the workings of pretended friends as well as of open enemies.

Now, Sir, you will allow that there never was such a Cabinet in

the world before; and it is a fact well worthy of the attention of Sovereigns, that the *content* of this Cabinet have been honesty and disinterestedness. These have been the cement of this singular Cabinet, and to the infinite honour of her Majesty she has not (as I have been informed from good authority) ever attempted to act a double part with those in whom she confided. It is fair, I think, to consider Mr. Alderman Wood as her *prime Minister*. He has had his troubles, I dare say, in counteracting the workings of some persons, to mention whom by name, would be wholly unnecessary. He has taken care of one point, so little thought of by too many others; and that is, he has not indulged himself in the vanity of *speech making*, when silence was necessary. In the opinions of some, he has carried his forbearance in this way to too great a length. The result, however, has shewn, that it is not the smallest of merits to be able to bridle one's tongue, even under circumstances of the most outrageous provocation. The truth is that the Alderman has, and upon numerous occasions, too, let his insolent foes escape unpunished, when he could, by only a single sentence, have blasted them for ever.

He has completely subdued his own feelings of resentment; because, and only because the indulgence of them might, by possibility, have done injury to her Majesty. Let me have pointed out to me, in the history of any country that you please, a man who has discovered evidences of public virtue greater than these?

I have clearly seen for a long time, that an attempt would be made to ascribe any new act of hostility to the Queen to some conduct of hers, arising out of the advice of those who are called her unofficial advisers. I have, therefore, thought it necessary thus to shew, not only the justice but the wisdom of the measures that her Majesty has pursued. And, I have only to add, in conclusion of this part of my subject, that if her Majesty now pursue the same just and wise course, there is before her the remainder of (I trust) a long life of happiness and real glory, surrounded by an affectionate and admiring people, to render whom happy, and to see them free, are well known to be the objects nearest and dearest to her heart.

I have not much room left to remark on the *legal* part of the debate. Mr. Wetherell's speech clearly shewed the illegality of

the omission of the name. The Attorney General answered him very ingeniously; and I looked in vain for a reply to him from Mr. SCARLETT, Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH and you. What Sir James and you said I could understand; but of Mr. Scarlett's discourse, I, possibly from my dullness of intellect, could make neither top nor tail. It bore a strong resemblance to what the printers call *pie*; that is to say, type of every letter in the alphabet, mixed up together in a heap, and requiring great time and pains to distribute them amongst their appropriate boxes or divisions. I have not time to distribute *pie*; and, therefore, I shall leave Mr. Scarlett's speech for the amusement of those that have leisure for such an employment.

The result of the debates was much about what I expected; and what, indeed, I had foretold. I am very sorry that the Liturgy question was not avoided by the Ministers by their advising of the King to put in the Queen's name at once. I am convinced that they will be compelled to yield at last, though I am not sure that they will, unless their opponents bring forward the mea-

sure of Reform, in *some shape or other*. This is the touchstone. This would give them the people at their back. And, till they adopt this course there never will be, in my opinion, a change of the Ministry. Indeed, there ought not to be. The turmoil will go on; great and important matters will be wholly neglected, or will be made questions of party; the distresses will continue to increase; no efficient measures will be adopted; those wonderful law-givers, Peter Moore and Edward Ellice, will be looked up to and implored in vain for assistance; on the first of May, while the chimney-sweepers are dancing decorated with flowers, sober and prudent men will be quietly walking to the *Bank* and from thence to the *Mint*, in order to get Sovereigns or guineas at par, to lay bye against a day of peril; about the first of June (if we have a dry March) the best wheat will sell for about six shillings a bushel, and the worst for about four; in July or August, Tradesmen and Farmers will be tumbling about and jostling each other down like nine pins or skittles; and about Christmas Pitt's famous

monument, called Public Credit will be shaken to it's very base.

Can any thing prevent this?

Wise measures, such as Peter Moore and Edward Ellice ought to be able to suggest, and of which they ought to be able to teach the execution, would not only prevent this, but would restore the country to prosperity and happiness; would take from the people all desire of *further change* (a Reform of the Parliament having been adopted); would place men of industry, public spirit and talent as the managers of public affairs; would drive crafty knaves, presumptuous fools and arrogant pretenders to exclusive loyalty into the shade, would shew foreign nations that the anger of England is not to be excited with impunity; would make a contented people, and a King guarded by the love of his subjects, and standing in need of no other protection or support.

That Peter Moore and Edward Ellice will propose and teach the execution of such measures is *possible*. If they do not; and if such measures be not adopted, consequences such as those that I have above described, will assuredly come in spite of all the doctrines of those wise

men the Edinburgh Reviewers, grammared as they are in the maxims of Hume and of Adam Smith. When the wild work begins; when confusion stares people in the face, in vain will applications be made to the *Oracle*; and, this nation once so great and so wise; but now under the superintending agency of jews and stock-jobbers, will, at last, perceive that my predictions are fulfilled; and I have little doubt, that many thousands will be found ready to burn me alive, because I was right while they were wrong.

There is one measure, and that a very simple one, which may stay the plague for a while; namely, a repeal of Mr. Peel's bill! This, however, would be so shameful a thing; it would be so clear an avowal of the impossibility of ever paying in cash; and, which is of perhaps still more importance to the parties, it would be so complete a proof, *that I alone was right* as to this great national matter, that to drag the measure forth would produce mortification and anguish impossible to be described and hardly to be conceived.

However, here am I, the spectator of the conduct of Peter Moore and Edward

Ellice. Here am I to witness what passes, and to view with as much indifference as the case will permit me to feel, all the workings, all the strugglings, all the mucking and moilings of those, who have so long persecuted me for no other cause than that I clearly predicted those very events, the series of which is now drawing to a close. To say that I shall behold this *with pleasure* would be false; but assuredly, I shall behold it without pain; for it is impossible but I must desire to triumph at last, and my triumph will be the most signal: my enemies will not have been punished by me, but by their own hands, and that, too, from causes, to prevent which I have laboured so perseveringly, and for having so laboured these enemies have endeavoured to effect my destruction.

In the midst of all the difficulties that menace the country, what a sight is it to behold the "*Great Council of the nation*" engaged in disputes about the Liturgy; debating for ten hours at a stretch whether the putting the Queen's name into the prayer book be a *right* that her Majesty can demand or a thing dependent on *grace and favour*! What a thing is this to behold! Here is a little point the granting of

which would at once silence a considerable portion of the public discontents; and yet it would really seem that this point is not to be yielded, without another and another struggle!

I now, Sir, come to the conclusion of my letter, in which I have endeavoured to defend the conduct of her Majesty in political matters; and I have endeavoured to impress upon your mind a conviction, that a straight forward path is always the best. You and I are probably destined to witness some very important events! and, not at all wishing to disguise that I have a very high opinion of your talents, I mean to convince you, that, whenever you again smite me upon one cheek, I shall not turn the other to your hand. You and your fellow labourer in the vineyard of briefs, have depicted me as a person that quits not his *victim* till he has laid him strangling in the dust. Say *Calumniator*; say literary assassin; say base wretch, who, too great a coward to deal the blow himself, resorts to a *hireling hand*: say either of these and I am proud to acknowledge that you are right; if such escape from me without receiving, *first or last*, the punishment due to his baseness, it will always be for

want of means and not for want of inclination. I am well acquainted with what passes relative to myself in the conciliabules of the faction to which you belong: I know what you wish as well as what you say. I remember well the declarations, the assertions, the remarks of the *Morning Chronicle*, while I was on the other side of the sea. I remember well how cheaply your faction had the arrogance to hold me. I did not storm; I did not rage; I kept patiently on my course, waiting for the suitable hour of retaliation; and, in spite of a hundred circumstances either of which were sufficient to subdue the mind of man, I am here to enjoy the triumph to which I am fairly and honourably entitled.

This is a great deal about *self*! Monstrous "*egotism*!" Yes, monstrous egotism, indeed, to claim my due and to be prepared for paying off only a small part of the long score of calumnies and infamous attacks of every kind. I have observed all the tricks that have been resorted to in order to sink me for ever. I have seen the most unnatural combinations having nothing in view but the effecting of this purpose; and, therefore, I will indulge myself

now that I see confusion spreading itself through the ranks of these combined enemies. Every one now allows, that the Country has been brought into ruin. I have constantly been proposing the measures to prevent this ruin. Hell itself seems to have been applied to for legions of devils to pour forth upon me; and let fools and hypocrites say what they will, the hour of exultation shall be enjoyed by me.

One great advantage that fools enjoy arises from the negligence and carelessness of men of sense. In time, the cautions, the advice, the arguments of the latter are forgotten as being *theirs*. The fools who have not been taught by them at first, take them up and *claim them as their own*. In the present case I will not be guilty of this sort of carelessness. I will travel back over the last seventeen years. I will bring forth anew the opinions and principles of *you all*. I will contrast them with my own, step by step and of convenient date, and I will at last tell you all in so many words, you *shall* adopt my opinions and my principles, or you *shall not* be able to save the country. Mortifying as this may be to the "*great men*," this is what they shall endure; and when they

have endured this to their heart's content, I shall think that I have obtained satisfaction.

WM COBBETT.

QUEEN'S MESSAGE
TO THE
HOUSE OF COMMONS.

" Caroline R.—The Queen,
" having learned that the House
" of Commons has appointed this
" day for taking into considera-
" tion the part of the King's
" most gracious Speech which re-
" lates to her, deems it necessary
" to declare, that she is duly sen-
" sible of his Majesty's conde-
" scension in recommending an
" arrangement respecting her to
" the attention of Parliament.
" She is aware that this recom-
" mendation must be understood
" as referring to a provision for
" the support of her estate and
" dignity; and from what has
" lately passed, she is apprehen-
" sive that such a provision may
" be unaccompanied by the pos-
" session of her rights and privi-
" leges in the ample measure
" wherein former Queens Con-
" sort, her Royal predecessors,
" have been wont in times past
" to enjoy them.

" It is far from the Queen's
" inclination needlessly to throw
" obstacles in the way of a set-
" tlement which she desires in

" common with the whole coun-
" try, and which she feels per-
" suaded the best interests of all
" parties equally require; and
" being most anxious to avoid
" every thing that might create
" irritation, she cautiously ab-
" stains from any observation
" upon the unexampled predica-
" ment in which she is placed,
" but she feels it due to the
" house and to herself respect-
" fully to declare, that she per-
" severes in the resolution of
" declining any arrangement
" while her name continues to
" be excluded from the Liturgy.
" Brandenburg-house, Jan. 31, 1821."

LETTER FROM MR. CANNING
TO ONE OF HIS CONSTITU-
ENTS.

" Tuddlenham, Norfolk, Dec. 23.

" My dear Sir,—I left town
" on Wednesday, a few minutes
" after I had written to you,
" not thinking that I should be
" quite so soon set at liberty
" to make to you the commu-
" nication promised in my
" letter of that morning. I had
" hitherto forbore to make
" that communication, in order
" that I might not any way
" embarrass others by a pre-
" mature disclosure; and I cer-
" tainly expected, in return,
" due notice of the time when

" it might suit them that the
 " disclosure should be made. I
 " have no doubt that the omis-
 " sion of such notice has been
 " a mere oversight. I regret
 " it only as it has prevented
 " me from anticipating, with
 " you and the rest of my
 " friends at Liverpool, the an-
 " nouncement in a newspaper
 " of an event in which I know
 " your kind partiality will in-
 " duce you to feel a lively in-
 " terest. The facts stated in
 " the *Courier* of Wednesday
 " evening are stated in sub-
 " stance correctly. I have re-
 " signed my office. My mo-
 " tive for separating myself
 " from the government (how-
 " ever reluctantly at a conjunc-
 " ture like the present) is to be
 " found solely in the proceedings
 " and pending 'discussions' re-
 " specting the Queen. There is (as
 " the *Courier* justly assumes) but
 " this 'one point of difference'
 " between my colleagues and my-
 " self. Those who may have done
 " me the honor to observe my con-
 " duct in this unhappy affair from
 " the beginning, will recollect that
 " on the first occasion on which it
 " was brought forward in the
 " House of Commons, I declared
 " my determination to take as lit-
 " tle part as possible in any sub-

" sequent stage of the proceed-
 " ings. This declaration was
 " made adviscdly. It was made,
 " not only after full communica-
 " tion with my colleagues, but as
 " an alternative suggested on their
 " part for my then retirement from
 " the administration. So long
 " as there was a hope of amica-
 " ble adjustment, my continuance
 " in the administration might
 " possibly be advantageous: that
 " hope was finally extinguished
 " by the failure of Mr. Wilber-
 " force's address. On the same
 " day on which the Queen's an-
 " swer to that address was re-
 " ceived by the House of Com-
 " mons, I asked an audience of
 " the King; and at that audience
 " (which I obtained the following
 " day), after respectfully repeating
 " to his Majesty the declaration
 " which I had made a fortnight be-
 " fore in the House of Commons,
 " and stating the impossibility of
 " my departing from it, I felt it my
 " duty humbly to lay at his Ma-
 " jesty's feet the tender of my
 " resignation.
 " The King, with a generosity
 " which I can never sufficiently
 " acknowledge, commanded me
 " to remain in his service, ab-
 " staining, as completely as I
 " might think fit, from any share
 " in the proceedings respecting

“ the Queen ; and gave me full
 “ authority to plead his Majesty’s
 “ express command for so con-
 “ tinuing in office.

“ No occasion subsequently
 “ occurred in Parliament (at
 “ least no adequate occasion) for
 “ availing myself of the use of
 “ this authority ; and I should
 “ have thought myself inexcusable
 “ in seeking an occasion for
 “ the purpose. But, from the
 “ moment of my receiving his
 “ Majesty’s gracious commands,
 “ I abstained entirely from all
 “ interference on the subject of
 “ the Queen’s affairs. I did not
 “ attend any meetings of the
 “ cabinet upon that subject ; I
 “ had no share whatever in pre-
 “ paring or approving the Bill of
 “ Pains or Penalties ; I was (as
 “ you know) absent from Eng-
 “ land during the whole progress
 “ of that Bill, and returned only
 “ after it had been withdrawn.

“ The new state in which I
 “ found the proceedings upon
 “ my return to England, required
 “ the most serious consideration.
 “ It was one to which I could not
 “ conceive the King’s command
 “ of June to be applicable. For
 “ a minister to absent him-
 “ self altogether from the ex-
 “ pected discussions in the House
 “ of Commons, intermixed, as

“ they were likely to be, with the
 “ general business of the session,
 “ appeared to me quite impossi-
 “ ble. To be present as a mi-
 “ nister taking no part in those
 “ discussions ; could only be pro-
 “ ductive of embarrassment to
 “ myself, and of perplexity to my
 “ colleagues. To take any part
 “ in them was now, as always,
 “ out of the question.

“ For these difficulties I saw
 “ no remedy, except in the hum-
 “ ble but earnest renewal to my
 “ Sovereign of the tender of my
 “ resignation ; which has been
 “ now as graciously accepted as
 “ it was in the former instance
 “ indulgently declined.

“ If some weeks have elapsed,
 “ since my return to England,
 “ before I could arrive at this
 “ practical result, the interval has
 “ been chiefly employed in re-
 “ conciling, or endeavouring to
 “ reconcile, my colleagues to a
 “ step taken by me in a spirit of
 “ the most perfect amity, and tend-
 “ ing (in my judgment) as much
 “ to their relief as to my own.

“ It remains for me only to
 “ add that having purchased, by
 “ the surrender of my office, the
 “ liberty of continuing to act in
 “ consistency with my original
 “ declarations, it is now my in-
 “ tention (but an intention per-

“fectly gratuitous, and one which
 “I hold myself completely free
 “to vary if I shall at any time
 “see occasion for so doing) to be
 “absent from England again,
 “until the agitation of this cala-
 “mitous affair shall be at an end.

“You may depend upon my
 “providing that the local inter-
 “ests of Liverpool shall not suf-
 “fer from my temporary ab-
 “sence.

“I request you, my dear Sir,
 “to have the goodness to com-
 “municate this letter to my
 “friends at Liverpool, as widely
 “as you may think necessary;
 “taking precautions only that it
 “may not find its way into print.
 “It is only to my friends and my
 “constituents that I should feel
 “myself either bound, or enti-
 “tled, to make so full and parti-
 “cular a communication.

“I have the honour to be,
 “with the greatest regard and
 “esteem, my dear Sir, your ob-
 “liged and faithful servant,

“GEO. CANNING.”

“P. S. I write in a part of the
 “country where the arrival and
 “departure of the post are so
 “inconveniently arranged, that
 “I hardly know when this letter
 “will reach you, if addressed di-
 “rectly to Liverpool. I think it

“best, therefore, to send it to
 “town, whence I hope it may
 “be forwarded to-morrow, so as
 “to reach you on Monday.

“The newspaper which has
 “given occasion to it, only came
 “to my hands late last night.”

GRAMMATICAL ERRORS

IN THE

LATE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Things of this character *should* be correctly written. Nobody will deny that. Correct writing is always desirable; but, surely, it is a shame, that any thing incorrect should come before the world from the united mind and pen of a dozen Privy Councillors. DOCTOR BLAIR has said, and very truly, that incorrectness of expression arises, most frequently, from a want of *clearness of head* in the speaker or writer. Yet, if we were to judge of the heads of some Ministers, Ambassadors, and Lawgivers by this rule, to what conclusion should we come!

A king's speech is a very short piece of writing. It is mere *statement*. Nothing can be more *simple* than the nature of it. All that is required, is, that it should be *dignified*, and *correct*; but, above all things *correct*. Surely, *we* have a *right* to expect this at the heads of twelve cabinet Minis-

ters, and especially when they are by no means backward to speak of us, in a lump, as *uninformed* and *low* people. And, is nothing *due to the King*, in this respect? Can his honour and dignity be duly consulted, when incorrect language is put into his mouth?

There is no apology to offer in a case like this: there is no want of *time*: there *ought* to be no want of *talent*: and, as to want of *attention*, that would be really *criminal*. It may, indeed, be said, that those Lord Chief Justices in the Court of Criticism, the *Edinburgh Reviewers*, write as incorrectly as the Ministers, as I have shown, in my observations on their late petition to the king: but, they are not *paid by the public*. Those who purchase their writings expend the amount *voluntarily*: whereas the money we pay to our Ministers is taken from us by the tax-gatherer.

When a writing drops from the pen in *haste*; when no time (or very little time) is allowed for examination, or revision; then, indeed, correctness is hardly to be expected; and, it is fortunate if a single page be *wholly* free from error of

every kind. But, when the writing is so short; when there is so much time for the performance of the work; and when days and days are allowed for revising and correcting; when *care* in the execution is so clearly a *duty*, is it too much to say, that *ignorance* is ascribable to the authors?

With these remarks in our minds, let us take a look at the following six paragraphs of the Speech. I have *numbered* them for the sake of reference.

"The measures by which,
"in the last Session of Parliament, you made *provision* for
"the expenses of my Civil Government, and *for the*
"honour and *dignity* of the
"Crown, demand my warmest
"acknowledgements.

"I have directed that the
"Estimates for the current year
"shall be laid before you, and
"it is a satisfaction to me to
"have been enabled to make
"some reduction in our Military
"Establishments.

"You will observe from the
"Accounts of the Public Revenue, that, notwithstanding
"the Receipts in Ireland have
"proved materially deficient, in
"consequence of the unfortu-

"nate circumstances which have
 "affected the Commercial Credit
 "of that part of the United
 "Kingdom, and although our
 "Foreign Trade, during the
 "early part of this time, was
 "in a state of depression, the
 "total Revenue has, neverthe-
 "less, exceeded that of the
 "preceding year.

"A considerable part of this
 "increase must be ascribed to
 "the new Taxes; but in some
 "of those branches, which are
 "the surest indications of in-
 "ternal wealth, the augmen-
 "tation has fully realised any
 "expectation which could have
 "been reasonably formed of
 "it.

"The separate provision which
 "was made for the Queen, as
 "Princess of Wales, in the year
 "1814, terminated with the de-
 "mise of his late Majesty.

"I have, in the mean time,
 "directed advances, as autho-
 "rised by Law; and it will,
 "under present circumstances,
 "be for you to consider what
 "new arrangements should be
 "made on this subject."

In the first paragraph provision
 is said to have been made for
 the honour and dignity of the
 crown. And how? Why, by
 a money-grant. What does this

honour and dignity depend on
 money? For the SUPPORT
 or MAINTENANCE of the
 splendor (which is exterior
 honour) and exterior dignity,
 money is necessary; but, surely,
 a vote of the Parliament is not
 necessary to create the honour
 and dignity of the throne? Surely
 these would exist without any
 provision made by the Parliament.

The word, *and*, in the second
 paragraph has no business there.
 This is one of those errors in com-
 position, which arise from a con-
 stant desire to be *hooking words*
 on to each other; and this desire
 is the natural offspring of a con-
 fused head.

In the third paragraph, "*this time*" is nonsense; and never-
 theless is a pure redundancy.

In the fourth paragraph,
 branches of revenue are called
indications of internal wealth.
 Now, the flourishing state of cer-
 tain branches of revenue may, per-
 haps be an indication of wealth;
 but the branches themselves can
 be no indication of the sort. For
 instance, am I to conclude that
 the country is rich, because there
 is a tax on beer?

The words, "in the mean
 time," in the sixth paragraph,
 have no meaning at all, unless
 they apply to the time, between

1814 and the death of the king ; and, then, they, surely express what his Majesty could not possibly mean.

Now, with all this before us, is it to be pert and insolent to request the Ministers to read attentively, before they write another Speech, that little Grammar, which I have published "for the use of Schools and of Young Persons in General ; and more especially for the use of Soldiers, Sailors, Apprentices and Plough-Boys ?" Really, they ought to do it ; and, why should they have any scruples ? Why should they be ashamed to be taught by me how to write, when they have not been ashamed to speak my Register (when it suited them) while they were abusing and persecuting its author ? If ever there was *plagiarism* ; barefaced *plagiarism* ; shameless *plagiarism*, it was exhibited in the *Six-Acts* Parliament, when *Mr. Peel's Bill* was under discussion. I had, in a Letter to the Prince Regent, published about a month previous to the discussion, described the origin and nature of money ; its powers in the affairs of nations ; and its importance in a political point of view. I had shown the necessity of its continuing in a

fixed state ; and the danger of any fluctuations in it. I had applied my principles to the actual state of things in England ; and had clearly demonstrated, that, while the Bank could augment, or diminish, the quantity of its paper *at pleasure*, no man in the kingdom could be said to possess any thing *worthy of the name of property*. I further showed, that, while the currency was in this state, the country never could go to war again.

The whole of this essay was put forth, in the Debates, by those who were for the Bill. The quotation was so close ; the repetition was so slavish, that it was like that of *School-Boys*, repeating their Lessons. But, observe, the measure was not what I had pointed out ! These wise-men took my arguments against the Bank ; but, there they stopped. They took none of my arguments in favour of the People. However, they went far enough to show to every reader of the Register, that they were not ashamed to learn, though they had not the grace to make any kind of acknowledgment to their teacher !

Well, let the Ministers, then learn a little Grammar from the same teacher. Here there will

be no *plagiarism*. Correct writing is the common property of the whole of a people. I shall not write *king's speeches*; and, therefore, if the authors of them write correctly, they will not be indebted to me in any way that will demand acknowledgment.

I will, one of these days, take a speech or two from the debates, of which I have just spoken, and will compare the several parts of them with my Letter to the Regent. The wise-men, the men of "the Great Council" talked about *Adam Smith* and about the *Late Lord Liverpool*; but, they took care to use *my principles and arguments*. I shall, when I have leisure, ransack their speeches, *claim my own*, and take it back again. Were I to do this fully, what a pretty figure the speech-makers would cut!

However, I have, for many years, been considered *fair game* for plagiarists of every sort and size, from lofty speech-makers down to the dealers in Grub-street paragraphs. Some have taken the *sentiments*; some have

taken the *words* also; others have gone so far as to take even the *name*; while some, more modest, have contented themselves with the *form*, the *bulk*, the *type* and the *price* of the publication, together with the *colour* and *quality* of the *paper*. But, though these literary pirates have exhibited such a great diversity in their modes of committing the act, there has been a wonderful accordance in another part of their conduct: that is, they have all, without a single exception, *calumniated* and *endeavoured to destroy*, me; proceeding, doubtless, upon the rule of the worthy fraternity whose pursuits they imitate, and who always have on their lips the saving-maxim, that "*Dead men tell no tales*." In another respect there has also been a coincidence as perfect as if arising from previous concert, or conspiracy: they have all, at the end of a few months, or weeks, dropped silently and quietly out of sight, and have never more been even heard of.